

DUALS AND TRANSFORMS OF IDEALS IN PVMDS

A. BENOBAID AND A. MIMOUNI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study when the dual of a t -ideal in a $PVMD$ is a ring? and we treat the question when it coincides with its endomorphism ring. We also study particular classes of overrings of $PVMD$ s. Specially, we investigate the Nagata transform and the endomorphism ring of ideals in $PVMD$ s in an attempt to establish analogues for well-known results on overrings of Prüfer domains.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R be an integral domain and K its quotient field. For a nonzero fractional ideals I and J of R , we define the fractional ideal $(I : J) = \{x \in K | xJ \subseteq I\}$. We denote $(R : I)$ by I^{-1} and we call it the dual of I since it is isomorphic, as an R -module, to $\text{Hom}_R(I, R)$. The Nagata transform (or ideal transform) of I is defined as $T(I) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (R : I^n)$ and the Kaplansky transform of I is defined as $\Omega(I) = \{u \in K : ua^{n(a)} \in R, a \text{ is an arbitrary element in } I \text{ and } n(a) \text{ some positive integer}\}$. The zero cohomology of I over R is defined by $R^I = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (I^n : I^n)$. It is clear that $(I : I) \subseteq R^I \subseteq T(I) \subseteq \Omega(I)$ and $(I : I) \subseteq I^{-1} \subseteq T(I) \subseteq \Omega(I)$. Also we notice that $\Omega(I)$ is a variant of the Nagata transform $T(I)$, and useful in the case when I is not finitely generated, but if I is a finitely generated ideal of R , then $\Omega(I) = T(I)$. It is worthwhile noting that $\Omega(I)$, $T(I)$, $(I : I)$ and R^I are overrings of R for each ideal I in a domain R , while I^{-1} is not, in general, a ring. Moreover, $(I : I)$ is the largest subring of K in which I is an ideal and it is isomorphic to the endomorphism ring of I .

In 1968, Brewer [3] proved a representation theorem for the Nagata transform $T(I)$, when I is a finitely generated ideal (which coincides in this case with $\Omega(I)$) and in 1974, Kaplansky [23] gave the complete description of the Kaplansky transform $\Omega(I)$ for each ideal I in an integral domain R . He proved that “if I is a nonzero ideal of R , then $\Omega(I) = \bigcap R_P$, where P varies over the set of prime ideals that do not contain I ” (this result was also obtained independently by Hays [15]). In [13, Exercise 11, page 331] Gilmer described $T(I)$ of an ideal I which is

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13A15, 13A18, 13F05; Secondary 13G05, 13F30.

Key words and phrases. dual of ideal, t -ideal, ideal transform, overring, $PVMD$.

This work is supported by KFUPM.

contained in a finite number of minimal prime ideals in a Prüfer domain R , specifically, “let R be a Prüfer domain, I a nonzero ideal of R , $\{P_\alpha\}$ the set of minimal prime ideals of I , and $\{M_\beta\}$ the set of maximal ideals that do not contain I . Then $T(I) \subseteq (\bigcap R_{Q_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$, where Q_α is the unique prime ideal determined by $\bigcap_{n=1}^\infty I^n R_{P_\alpha} = Q_\alpha R_{P_\alpha}$. Moreover, if the set $\{P_\alpha\}$ is finite, equality holds” (see also [11, Theorem 3.2.5]). In [11], Fontana, Huckaba and Papick described some relations between the above overrings in the case of Prüfer domains. For instance, they showed that “if P is a nonzero non-invertible prime ideal of a Prüfer domain R , then there is no proper overring between P^{-1} and $\Omega(P)$ ” ([11, Theorem 3.3.7]). In 1986, Houston [17] studied the divisorial prime ideals in PVMDs, and among others, he proved that “if P is a nonzero, non- t -maximal t -prime ideal of a PVMD R , then $P^{-1} = R_P \cap C_t(I)$, where $C_t(I) = \bigcap_{I \not\subseteq M_\beta \in \text{Max}_t(R)} R_{M_\beta}$, and $T(P) = R_{P_0} \cap C_t(I)$, where $P_0 = (\bigcap_n P^n R_P) \cap R$ ” ([17, Proposition 1.1 and Proposition 1.5]).

Many papers in the literature deal with the fractional ideal I^{-1} . The main problem is to examine settings in which I^{-1} is a ring. In 1982, Huckaba and Papick [19] stated the following: “let R be a Prüfer domain, I a nonzero ideal of R , $\{P_\alpha\}$ the set of minimal prime ideals of I , and $\{M_\beta\}$ the set of maximal ideals that do not contain I . Then $I^{-1} \supseteq (\bigcap R_{P_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$. If I^{-1} is a ring, equality holds” ([19, Theorem 3.2 and Lemma 3.3]). They also proved that “for a radical ideal I of a Prüfer domain R , let $\{P_\alpha\}$ be the set of minimal prime ideals of I and assume that $\bigcap P_\alpha$ is irredundant. Then I^{-1} is a subring of K if and only if for each α , P_α is not invertible” ([19, Theorem 3.8]). In [16], Heinzer and Papick gave a necessary and sufficient condition for I^{-1} , when it is a ring, to collapse with $(I : I)$ for an ideal I in a Prüfer domain with Noetherian spectrum. Namely, they proved that “for a Prüfer domain R with $\text{Spec}(R)$ Noetherian, let I be a nonzero ideal of R and assume that I^{-1} is a ring. Then $I^{-1} = (I : I)$ if and only if $I = \sqrt{I}$ (i.e. I is a radical ideal) if and only if the minimal prime ideals of I in $(I : I)$ are all maximal ideals” ([16, Theorem 2.5]). In 1993, Fontana, Huckaba, Papick and Roitman [12] studied the endomorphism ring of an ideal in a Prüfer domain. One of their main results asserted that “for a nonzero ideal I of a Prüfer domain R , let $\{Q_\alpha\}$ be the set of maximal prime ideals of $\mathcal{Z}(R, I)$ and $\{M_\beta\}$ be the set of maximal ideals that do not contain I . Then $(I : I) \supseteq (\bigcap R_{Q_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$. Moreover, if R is a QR-domain, equality holds” ([12, Theorem 4.11 and Corollary 4.4]). Finally in 2000, Houston, Kabbaj, Lucas and Mimouni [18], gave several characterizations of when I^{-1} is a ring for a nonzero ideal I in an integrally closed domain. For instance they generalized [12, Theorem 4.11] to the PVMD’s case. Namely they proved that “if I is an ideal of a PVMD with no embedded primes, then I^{-1} is a ring if and only if $I^{-1} = (I : I) = R_{\mathfrak{N}} \cap C_t(I)$, where $\mathfrak{N}$ the complement in R of the set of zero divisors on R/I ” ([18, Theorem 4.7]).

The purpose of this paper is to continue the investigation of when the dual of an ideal in a *PVMD* is a ring and when it coincides with its endomorphism ring. We also aim at giving a full description of the Nagata and Kaplansky transforms of ideals in a *PVMD*, seeking generalizations or *t*-analogues of well-known results.

In Section 2, we deal with the dual of a *t*-ideal in a *PVMD*. We give a generalization of the above mentioned results of Huckaba-Papick and Heinzer-Papick. Precisely, we prove that “for a radical *t*-ideal *I* of a *PVMD* *R*, let $\{P_\alpha\}$ be the set of minimal prime ideals of *I* and assume that $\bigcap P_\alpha$ is irredundant. Then I^{-1} is a subring of *K* if and only if P_α is not *t*-invertible for each α ” (Theorem 2.3). We also prove that “if *R* is a *PVMD* with $\text{Spec}_t(R)$ Noetherian, and *I* is a *t*-ideal of *R* such that I^{-1} is a ring, then $I^{-1} = (I : I)$ if and only if $I = \sqrt{I}$ if and only if the minimal prime ideals of *I* in $(I : I)$ are all *t*-maximal ideals” (Theorem 2.5). In the particular case where *R* is a Prüfer domain we obtain the pre-mentioned results of Huckaba-Papick and Heinzer-Papick simply by remarking that a Prüfer domain is just a *PVMD* in which the *t*-operation is trivial, that is, $t = d$. We close this section with a description of the endomorphism ring of a *t*-ideal in a *tQR*-domain. Particularly we give a generalization of a well-known result by Fontana et al., [12, Corollary 4.4 and Theorem 4.11], that is, “let *I* be a *t*-ideal of a *PVMD* *R*, $\{Q_\alpha\}$ be the set of all maximal prime ideals of $Z(R, I)$ and $\{M_\beta\}$ be the set of *t*-maximal ideals of *R* that do not contain *I*. Then $(I : I) \supseteq (\bigcap R_{Q_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$, and if *R* is a *tQR*-domain then the equality holds” (Theorem 2.13).

Section 3 deals with Kaplansky and Nagata transforms of an ideal in a *PVMD*. Our aim is to give the *t*-analogues for many results of Fontana-Huckaba-Papick [11, Section 3.3] for *t*-linked overrings of *PVMD*s. Our first main theorem generalizes [11, Theorem 3.3.7] to the case of *t*-prime ideals in a *PVMD*. For instance we prove that “if *P* is a non-*t*-invertible *t*-prime ideal of a *PVMD* *R*, then there is no proper overring between P^{-1} and $\Omega(P)$ ” (Theorem 3.2). The second main theorem is a satisfactory *t*-analogue for [11, Theorem 3.3.10], that is, “let *R* be a *PVMD* and *P* a *t*-prime ideal of *R*. Then $T(P) \subsetneq \Omega(P)$ if and only if $T(P) = R_P \cap \Omega(P)$ and $\Omega(P) \not\subseteq R_P$. Moreover, $(P\Omega(P))_{t_1} = \Omega(P)$ if and only if $\Omega(P) \not\subseteq R_P$ if and only if $P = \sqrt{I}$ for some *t*-invertible ideal” (Theorem 3.6). Other applications of the obtained results are given.

Throughout this paper *R* is an integral domain with quotient field *K*. By a fractional ideal, we mean a nonzero *R*-submodule *I* of *K* such that $dI \subseteq R$ for some nonzero element *d* of *R* and by a proper ideal we mean a nonzero ideal *I* such that $I \subsetneq R$. Recall that for a fractional ideal *I* of *R*, the *v*-closure of *I* is the fractional ideal $I_v = (I^{-1})^{-1}$ and the *t*-closure of *I* is the ideal $I_t = \bigcup J_v$, where *J* ranges over the set of all finitely generated subideals of *I*. A fractional ideal *I* is said to be a *v*-ideal (or divisorial) (resp. *t*-ideal, resp. *t*-invertible) if $I = I_v$ (resp. $I = I_t$, resp. $(II^{-1})_t = R$), and a domain *R* is said to be a *PVMD* (for Prüfer

v -multiplication domain) if every nonzero finitely generated ideal is t -invertible (equivalently, R_M is a valuation domain for every t -maximal ideal M of R). For more details on the v - and t -operations, we refer the reader to [13, section 32]. Also it is worth to note that many of our results are inspired from the Prüfer case, and some proofs are dense and use a lot of technics of the t -operation. We are grateful to the huge work on the t -move (from Prüfer to $PVMD$) done during the last decades.

2. DUALS OF IDEALS IN A $PVMD$

We start this section by noticing that for a fractional ideal I of a domain R , $I^{-1} = (I_t)^{-1} = (I_v)^{-1}$, I is t -invertible if and only if I_t is t -invertible and if $I_t = R$, then $I^{-1} = (I : I) = R$. In this regard, we will focus on the case where I is a proper t -ideal of R .

Before giving the first main theorem of this section, we begin with the following two results on necessary and sufficient conditions for I^{-1} to be a ring. The first one is a generalization of [19, Lemma 2.0] (since invertible ideals are t -invertible t -ideals) and the second one is a t -analogue of [18, Proposition 2.2].

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a domain and I a t -ideal of R . If I is t -invertible, then I^{-1} is not a ring.*

Proof. Deny, assume that I^{-1} is a ring. Let M be a t -maximal ideal of R containing I . Since I is t -invertible, then II^{-1} is not contained in any t -maximal ideal of R . Hence $(II^{-1})_M = R_M$. So IR_M is an invertible ideal of R_M and hence principal. Since I is t -invertible, then I is v -finite. Hence there is a finitely generated ideal A of R such that $A \subseteq I$ and $I = A_t = A_v$. Since A is a finitely generated ideal of R , by [25, Lemma 4], $(AR_M)_{v_1} = (A_v R_M)_{v_1}$, where v_1 is the v -operation with respect to R_M . So $(IR_M)^{-1} = (A_v R_M)^{-1} = (AR_M)^{-1} = A^{-1} R_M = (A_v)^{-1} R_M = I^{-1} R_M$. Since I^{-1} is a ring, $(IR_M)^{-1}$ is also a ring, which contradicts the fact that IR_M is principal in R_M . $\square$

Corollary 2.2. *Let I be a t -ideal of a domain R . Then I^{-1} is a ring if and only if I is not t -invertible and $(M : I)$ is a ring for each t -maximal ideal $M \supseteq I$ of R .*

Proof. If I^{-1} is a ring, then I is not t -invertible by Lemma 2.1. By [18, Proposition 2.1], $(M : I)$ is a ring for each t -maximal ideal M containing I . Conversely, if I is not t -invertible, then $II^{-1} \subseteq M$ for some t -maximal ideal M of R and hence $I^{-1} = (M : I)$. So I^{-1} is a ring. $\square$

Now, we turn our attention to the duals of ideals in a $PVMD$. Our approach is similar to that one of Huckaba-Papick done in [19] for Prüfer domains. Let R be a $PVMD$. We divide $\text{Spec}_t(R)$, that is, the set of all nonzero t -prime ideals of R , into three disjoint sets:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \{P \in \text{Spec}_t(R) : P \text{ is } t\text{-invertible}\} \\ S_2 &= \{P \in \text{Spec}_t(R) : P \text{ is a non-} t\text{-invertible } t\text{-maximal ideal and } PR_P \text{ is principal}\} \end{aligned}$$

$S_3 = \{P \in \text{Spec}_t(R) : P \not\subseteq S_1 \cup S_2\}$. Our first main theorem is a generalization of [19, Theorem 3.8] to *PVMDs*.

Theorem 2.3. *Let I be a radical t -ideal of a *PVMD* R , $\{P_\alpha\}$ the set of all minimal prime ideals of I and assume that $\bigcap P_\alpha$ is irredundant. Then I^{-1} is a subring of K if and only if P_α is not t -invertible for each α .*

Proof. $(\Rightarrow)$ If I^{-1} is a ring, by [18, Proposition 2.1(2)], $(P_\alpha)^{-1}$ is a ring for each α . So, by Lemma 2.1, P_α is not t -invertible for each α . Whence $\{P_\alpha\} \subseteq S_2 \cup S_3$.

$(\Leftarrow)$ By [18, Lemma 4.3], it is enough to prove that $I^{-1} \subseteq (\bigcap R_{P_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$ where $\{M_\beta\}$ is the set of all t -maximal ideals of R that do not contain I . Clearly $I^{-1} \subseteq \bigcap R_{M_\beta}$ (for if $x \in I^{-1}$ and $a \in I \setminus M_\beta$, then $x = \frac{xa}{a} \in R_{M_\beta}$). Now we show that $I^{-1} \subseteq \bigcap R_{P_\alpha}$. Let P_α be any minimal prime over I . Since P_α is not t -invertible, $P_\alpha \in S_2 \cup S_3$. If $P_\alpha \in S_2$, set $J := \bigcap_{\gamma \neq \alpha} P_\gamma$. Then $I = J \cap P_\alpha$ and since $\bigcap P_\alpha$ is irredundant, $J \not\subseteq P_\alpha$. But since P_α is a non- t -invertible t -maximal ideal of a *PVMD* R , $(J + P_\alpha)_t = R$ and $(P_\alpha)^{-1} = R$.

Claim. Let R be a *PVMD* and A and B nonzero ideals of R such that $(A+B)_t = R$. Then $(A \cap B)_t = (AB)_t$. Indeed, by [22] it suffices to check that $(A \cap B)_t R_M = (AB)_t R_M$ for every t -maximal ideal M of R . Let M be a t -maximal ideal of R . Since A and B are t -comaximal, then either $A \not\subseteq M$ or $B \not\subseteq M$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $A \not\subseteq M$. Hence, by [20, Lemma 3.3] $(A \cap B)_t R_M = (A \cap B) R_M = A R_M \cap B R_M = R_M \cap B R_M = B R_M = A B R_M = (AB)_t R_M$, as desired.

Now, by the claim $I = J \cap P_\alpha = (J \cap P_\alpha)_t = (J P_\alpha)_t$. So $I^{-1} = (J P_\alpha)^{-1} = (R : P_\alpha J) = ((R : P_\alpha) : J) = (R : J) = J^{-1}$. But since $J \not\subseteq P_\alpha$, $I^{-1} = J^{-1} \subseteq R_{P_\alpha}$. Assume that $P_\alpha \in S_3$ and let N be a t -maximal ideal of R properly containing P_α . Since I is a radical ideal of R , $I R_N = P_\alpha R_N$. Since $P_\alpha R_N$ is a nonmaximal prime ideal of the valuation domain R_N , it is not invertible. Hence $I^{-1} \subseteq (I^{-1})_{R \setminus N} \subseteq (R_N : I R_N) = (R_N : P_\alpha R_N) = R_{P_\alpha}$ ([19, Corollary 3.6]), as desired. $\square$

The following example shows that the irredundancy condition in Theorem 2.3 cannot be removed. This example is a slight modification of [18, Example 5.1], where the authors constructed an example of a Bezout domain R with a principal ideal I (so I^{-1} is not a ring) such that P^{-1} is a ring for each minimal prime ideal P of I . Our example is just an adjunct of an indeterminate Y to the domain R to get outside the Prüfer situation but keeping us in the context of *PVMDs*.

Example 2.4. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be the field of rational numbers and set $T = \mathbb{Q}[\{X^n : n \in \mathbb{Q}^+\}]$ and $J = (X - 1)T$. By ([18, Example 5.1]), T is a Bezout domain, J is a principal radical ideal of T (so J^{-1} is not a ring) and P^{-1} is a ring for each minimal P over J in T . Also, by [19, Theorem 3.8], the intersection of the minimal primes

of J is not an irredundant intersection. Now let $R = T[Y]$, $I = J[Y]$. Clearly R is a *PVMD* (which is not Prüfer), and I is a radical principal ideal of R (so $I^{-1} = J^{-1}[Y]$ is not a ring). Since $J = I \cap T \subseteq Q \cap T = P$, it is easy to check that every minimal prime ideal Q of R over I is of the form $Q = P[Y]$, where P is a minimal prime ideal of T over J . Hence $Q^{-1} = P^{-1}[Y]$ is a ring for each Q . Finally $I = J[Y] = (\bigcap P)[Y] = \bigcap P[Y]$ is not an irredundant intersection.

Let T be an overring of an integral domain R . According to [5], T is said to be *t-linked* over R if for each finitely generated ideal I of R with $I^{-1} = R$, we have $(IT)^{-1} = T$. Also we say that T is *t-flat* over R if $T_M = R_P$ for each *t*-maximal ideal M of T , where $P = R \cap M$ (cf. [24]). Finally, we say that $\text{Spec}_t(R)$ is Noetherian if R satisfies the a.c.c. condition on the radical *t*-ideals. Our second main theorem generalizes Heinzer-Papick's theorem [16, Theorem 2.5].

Theorem 2.5. *Let R be a PVMD with $\text{Spec}_t(R)$ Noetherian, and let I be a *t*-ideal of R . Assume that I^{-1} is a ring. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) $I^{-1} = (I : I)$;
- (ii) $I = \sqrt{I}$;
- (iii) *The minimal prime ideals of I in $(I : I)$ are all *t*-maximal ideals.*

The proof of this theorem involves several lemmas of independent interest, some of them are *t*-analogues of well-known results.

Lemma 2.6. *Let T be a *t*-flat overring of a domain R . The following equivalent conditions hold:*

- (i) $I_t \subseteq (IT)_{t_1}$ for each $I \in F(R)$, where t_1 is the *t*-operation w.r. to T .
- (ii) If J is a *t*-ideal of T and $J \cap R \neq 0$, then $J \cap R$ is a *t*-ideal of R .
- (iii) $I_v T \subseteq (IT)_{v_1}$ for each $I \in f(R)$, where v_1 is the *v*-operation w.r. to T .
- (iv) $(IT)_{v_1} = (I_v T)_{v_1}$ for each $I \in f(R)$.
- (v) $(IT)_{t_1} = (I_t T)_{t_1}$ for each $I \in F(R)$.
- (vi) $(IT)_{v_1} = (I_t T)_{v_1}$ for each $I \in F(R)$.

Proof. The six conditions are equivalent for an arbitrary overring T of R by [2, Proposition 1.1]. To prove (i), let $x \in I_t$. Then there is a finitely generated ideal J of R such that $J \subseteq I$ and $x(R : J) \subseteq R$. Now, let N be a *t*-maximal ideal of T and set $M = N \cap R$. Since T is *t*-flat over R , $T_N = R_M$. Since J is finitely generated, $x(T : JT)T_N = x(T_N : JT_N) = x(R_M : JR_M) = x(R : J)R_M \subseteq R_M = T_N$. Hence $x(T : JT) \subseteq T$ and so $x \in (JT)_{v_1} \subseteq (IT)_{t_1}$, as desired. $\square$

The next lemma is crucial and it is a generalization of [13, Theorem 26.1]. We will often use it whenever we want to prove that an overring T of a *PVMD* domain R is contained in R_Q for some *t*-prime ideal Q of R .

Lemma 2.7. *Let R be a PVMD and T a *t*-linked overring of R . Then:*

- (i) If M is a t -prime ideal of T , then $T_M = R_P$ and $M = PR_P \cap T$, where $P = M \cap R$.
- (ii) If P is a nonzero t -prime ideal of R , then $(PT)_{t_1} \neq T$ if and only if $R_P \supseteq T$, where t_1 is the t -operation w.r. to T .
- (iii) If J is a t -ideal of T and $I = J \cap R$, then $J = (IT)_{t_1}$.
- (iv) $\{(PT)_{t_1}\}_{P \in \Delta}$ is the set of all t -prime ideals of T , where $\Delta = \{P \in \text{Spec}_t(R) : (PT)_{t_1} \neq T\}$.

Proof. (i) Since T is a t -linked overring of a PVMD R , T is a t -flat overring of R ([24, Proposition 2.10]). Hence $R_P = T_M$ where $P = M \cap R$ ([7, Theorem 2.6]). Therefore $M = MT_M \cap T = PR_P \cap T$.

(ii) If $(PT)_{t_1} \subsetneq T$, then there is a t -maximal ideal M of T such that $M \supseteq (PT)_{t_1}$. Since $M \cap R \supseteq (PT)_{t_1} \cap R \supseteq PT \cap R \supseteq P$, $R_P \supseteq R_{M \cap R} = T_M \supseteq T$, as desired.

Conversely, if $R_P \supseteq T \supseteq R$, then $T_{R \setminus P} = R_P$. Hence R_P is t -linked over T . So, by Lemma 2.6, $(PT)_{t_1} \subseteq (PR_P)_{t_2} = PR_P \subsetneq R_P$ (here t_2 is the t -operation w.r. to R_P and it is trivial since R_P is valuation). Since $T_{R \setminus P} = R_P$ is a valuation overring of a PVMD T , $J_{t_1} T_{R \setminus P} = JT_{R \setminus P}$ for each ideal J of T . If $(PT)_{t_1} = T$, then $R_P = T_{R \setminus P} = (PT)_{t_1} T_{R \setminus P} = PT_{R \setminus P} = PR_P$, a contradiction. Therefore $(PT)_{t_1} \subsetneq T$.

(iii) Clearly $(IT)_{t_1} \subseteq J$. It suffices to show that $J \subseteq (IT)_{t_1}$. Let $\{M_\alpha\}$ be the set of all t -maximal ideals of T . Since T is a t -linked overring of R , T is a PVMD. Hence $J = \bigcap JT_{M_\alpha}$. Set $P_\alpha = M_\alpha \cap R$ for each α and let $x \in JR_{M_\alpha} = JR_{P_\alpha}$. Then $x = \frac{a}{t}$, where $a \in J$ and $t \in R \setminus P_\alpha$. Since $J \subseteq T \subseteq T_{M_\alpha} = R_{P_\alpha}$, then $a = \frac{b}{s}$, where $b \in R$ and $s \in R \setminus P_\alpha$. Hence $b = as \in J \cap R = I$. So $x = \frac{b}{st} \in IR_{P_\alpha} \subseteq (IT)_{R_{P_\alpha}} = (IT)_{T_{M_\alpha}}$. Therefore $J \subseteq (IT)_{t_1}$, as desired.

(iv) By (iii), each t -prime ideal of T is of the form $(PT)_{t_1}$ for some $P \in \Delta$. Conversely, if $P \in \Delta$, then $P_t R_P = PR_P$ is a t -prime ideal of R_P ([20, Lemma 3.3] and R_P is a valuation domain) and $T \subseteq R_P$ (by part(ii)). So $R_P = T_{R \setminus P}$ and then R_P is t -linked over T . Hence $PR_P \cap T$ is a t -prime ideal of T (Lemma 2.6) and $PR_P \cap T = (((PR_P \cap T) \cap R)T)_{t_1} = (PT)_{t_1}$ by (iii). $\square$

The next lemma is a generalization of [16, Lemma 2.4] and it relates the fact I^{-1} not being a ring to a kind of “separation property” for a minimal prime ideal over a t -ideal of a PVMD.

Lemma 2.8. *Let R be a PVMD, I a t -ideal of R and P a minimal prime ideal over I in R . If there is a finitely generated ideal J of R such that $I \subseteq J \subseteq P$, then I^{-1} is not a ring.*

Proof. By the way of contradiction, assume that I^{-1} is a ring. Then by [18, Theorem 4.5] and [22, Theorem 2.22], $I^{-1} \subseteq R_P$ and I^{-1} is a t -linked overring of R . So R_P is t -linked over I^{-1} . Since $J^{-1} \subseteq I^{-1}$, $R = (JJ^{-1})_t \subseteq (JI^{-1})_{t_1}$ where t_1 is the t -operation w.r. to I^{-1} (Lemma 2.6). Also by Lemma 2.6, $(PI^{-1})_{t_1} \subseteq (PR_P)_{t_2} = PR_P$ (where t_2 is the t -operation w.r. to R_P , so it is trivial). Therefore $1 \in R = (JJ^{-1})_t \subseteq (JI^{-1})_{t_1} \subseteq (PI^{-1})_{t_1} \subseteq PR_P$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 2.9. ([21, Lemma 2.6]) *Let R be a PVMD and I a t -ideal of R . Then I is a t -ideal of $(I : I)$.*

Lemma 2.10. ([7, Lemma 3.7]) *Let R be an integral domain. The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) *Each t -prime ideal is the radical of a v -finite ideal.*
- (ii) *Each radical t -ideal is the radical of a v -finite ideal.*
- (iii) *$\text{Spec}_t(R)$ is Noetherian.*

Proof of Theorem 2.5 (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Follows from [1, Proposition 3.3] without any more conditions.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Deny, assume that $I \subsetneq \sqrt{I}$. Then there is a t -maximal ideal M of R such that IR_M is not a radical ideal. Moreover, there is a prime ideal P contained in M and minimal over I with $IR_M \subsetneq PR_M$ and $\sqrt{IR_M} = PR_M$. Note that P is a t -prime ideal of R (as a minimal prime over a t -ideal).

Claim 1. $IR_P = PR_P$.

Deny. Let $b \in P$ such that $IR_P \subsetneq bR_P \subseteq PR_P$. Since $\text{Spec}_t(R)$ is Noetherian, $P = \sqrt{(a_1, \dots, a_r)_v}$ for some $a_1, \dots, a_r \in P$. Set $J := (a_1, \dots, a_r, b)$. Note that $P = \sqrt{J_v}$ ($P = \sqrt{(a_1, \dots, a_r)_v} \subseteq \sqrt{(a_1, \dots, a_r, b)_v} \subseteq P$). Now, we prove that $I \subseteq J \subseteq P$, which contradicts the assumption that I^{-1} is a ring by Lemma 2.8. Let N be a t -maximal ideal of R . If $P \not\subseteq N$, then $R_N = PR_N = \sqrt{J_v R_N} = \sqrt{J_t R_N} = \sqrt{J R_N}$ (the last equality holds since N is t -prime, [20, Lemma 3.3]). Hence $JR_N = R_N \supseteq IR_N$. Assume that $P \subseteq N$. Then $PR_P = PR_N$ since R_P is an overring of the valuation domain R_N . Since $IR_P \subsetneq bR_P$, $b^{-1}I \subsetneq R_P$ and so $b^{-1}I \subseteq PR_P = PR_N \subseteq R_N$. Hence $IR_N \subseteq bR_N \subseteq JR_N$ as desired.

Now since R_M is a valuation domain, $Z(R_M, IR_M) = QR_M$ for some t -prime ideal $Q \subseteq M$. Since R is a PVMD and P and Q are t -primes under the t -maximal ideal M , Q and P are comparable under inclusion. Moreover, let $x \in PR_M \setminus IR_M$. Since $PR_M = PR_P = IR_P$ (Claim 1), there exists $y \in R \setminus P$ such that $yx \in I$. Hence $y \in Z(R_M, IR_M) \cap R = Q$ and therefore $P \subsetneq Q$.

Claim 2. $(QI^{-1})_{t_1} = I^{-1}$.

Note that $I^{-1} = (I : I)$ is a subintersection of R ([18, Theorem 4.5]) and so I^{-1} is t -linked over R ([22, Theorem 2.22]). Since $\text{Spec}_t(R)$ is Noetherian, $Q = \sqrt{A_v}$ for some finitely generated ideal A of R . Say $A = \sum_{n=1}^{n=m} b_n R$. Since $P \subsetneq Q$, $P \subsetneq A_v$. Indeed, let N be a t -maximal ideal of R . If $Q \not\subseteq N$, then $PR_N \subsetneq R_N = QR_N = AR_N$. If $Q \subseteq N$, then AR_N and PR_N are comparable as ideals of the valuation domain R_N . But if $AR_N \subseteq PR_N$, then $QR_N = \sqrt{A_v R_N} = \sqrt{A_t R_N} = \sqrt{AR_N} \subseteq PR_N$ and so $Q \subseteq P$, which is absurd. Hence $PR_N \subsetneq AR_N$ and therefore $P \subsetneq A_t = A_v$. Now since $I \subseteq P \subseteq A_v$, $A^{-1} \subseteq I^{-1}$. So $1 \in R = (AA^{-1})_t \subseteq (AI^{-1})_t \subseteq (AI^{-1})_{t_1} \subseteq (QI^{-1})_{t_1}$ (Lemma 2.6). Hence $(QI^{-1})_{t_1} = I^{-1}$, as desired. Finally, by Lemma 2.7, $I^{-1} \not\subseteq R_Q$. On the other hand $(I : I) \subseteq (I : I)_{R_M} \subseteq (IR_M : IR_M) = (R_M)_{QR_M} = R_Q$ by [11, Lemma 3.1.9], which is absurd. It follows that I is a radical ideal of R .

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) Assume that all minimal prime ideals of I in $(I : I)$ are t -maximal ideals. If $I \subsetneq \sqrt{I}$, as in the proof of (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii), there exist two t -prime ideals P and Q of R such that $I \subseteq P \subsetneq Q$ and $(I : I) \subseteq R_Q$. Then $(I : I)_{R \setminus Q} = R_Q$ and so R_Q is t -linked over $(I : I)$. Hence $QR_Q \cap (I : I)$ and $PR_Q \cap (I : I)$ are t -prime ideals of $(I : I)$ with $I \subseteq PR_Q \cap (I : I) \subsetneq QR_Q \cap (I : I)$ which is absurd.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) Assume that $I^{-1} = (I : I)$ and let P be a minimal prime of $(I : I)$ over I . By Lemma 2.9, I is a t -ideal of $(I : I)$ and so P is a t -prime ideal of $(I : I)$ (as a minimal prime over a t -ideal). Now by a way of contradiction, assume that there is a t -prime ideal Q of $(I : I)$ such that $P \subsetneq Q$. Since $(I : I)$ is a t -linked overring of R , $P = (P'(I : I))_{t_1}$ and $Q = (Q'(I : I))_{t_1}$ for some t -prime ideals P' and Q' of R with $I \subseteq P' \subsetneq Q'$ (Lemma 2.7(iv)). Set $Q' = \sqrt{A}$ for some finitely generated ideal A of R . As in the proof of Claim 2, $I \subseteq P' \subseteq A_t$. So $A^{-1} \subseteq I^{-1} = (I : I)$. Hence $1 \in R = (AA^{-1})_t \subseteq (A(I : I))_{t_1} \subseteq (Q'(I : I))_{t_1} = Q$, which is absurd. It follows that P is a t -maximal ideal of $(I : I)$, completing the proof. $\square$

The next two results deal with the duals of primary t -ideals in a PVMD.

Proposition 2.11. (cf. [10, Lemma 4.4]) *Let R be a PVMD and I a primary t -ideal of R . If I^{-1} is a ring, then $I^{-1} = (I : I)$.*

Proof. Deny, assume that there is $x \in I^{-1} \setminus (I : I)$. Since I is a t -ideal of R , there is $a \in I$ and a t -maximal ideal M of R such that $xa \notin IR_M$. Since $I^{-1} = (\bigcap R_{P_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$ ([18, Theorem 4.5]), $x \in R_{M_\beta}$ for each β and hence $I \subseteq M$. Therefore there is a minimal prime $I \subseteq P_\alpha \subseteq M$. Thus $x \in R_{P_\alpha}$. Write $x = \frac{b}{s}$ where $b \in R$ and $s \in R \setminus P_\alpha$. If $t = \frac{s}{a} \in R_M$, then $s = ta \in PR_M \cap R = P$, which is a contradiction. If $\frac{a}{s} \in R_M$, since I is a primary ideal of R , $ax = a\frac{b}{s} = b\frac{a}{s} \in IR_{P_\alpha} \cap R_M = IR_M$, which is a contradiction too. It follows that $I^{-1} = (I : I)$. $\square$

Corollary 2.12. (cf. [11, Proposition 3.1.14]) *Let R be a PVMD with $\text{Spec}_t(R)$ Noetherian and I a t -ideal of R . If I is a primary ideal which is not prime, then I^{-1} is not a ring.*

Proof. Deny, assume that I^{-1} is a ring. Then $I^{-1} = (I : I)$ by Proposition 2.11. Therefore I is a radical ideal (and so prime) by Theorem 2.5, which is absurd. $\square$

According to [13, Section 27], a Prüfer domain R is called a QR-domain if each overring of R is a quotient ring of R . In [6] the authors defined t QR-domains as PVMDs R such that each t -linked overring of R is a quotient ring of R and they characterized t QR-domains as follows: “Let R be a PVMD. Then R is a t QR-domain if and only if for each f.g. ideal A of R , there is $n \geq 1$ and $b \in R$ such that $A^n \subseteq bR \subseteq A_v$ ” [6, Theorem 1.3].

We close this section with a third main theorem. It generalizes a well-known results by Fontana et al. [12, Corollary 4.4 and Theorem 4.11] and gives a description of $(I : I)$ for a t -ideal I in a PVMD that is a t QR-domain.

Theorem 2.13. *Let I be a t -ideal of a PVMD R , $\{Q_\alpha\}$ be the set of all maximal prime ideals of $Z(R, I)$ and $\{M_\beta\}$ be the set of t -maximal ideals of R that do not contain I . Then:*

- (i) $(I : I) \supseteq (\bigcap R_{Q_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$;
- (ii) *If R is a t QR-domain then the equality holds.*

Before proving this theorem, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.14. *Let I be a t -ideal of a PVMD R and let $\{Q_\alpha\}$ be the set of all prime ideals of $Z(R, I)$. Then Q_α is a t -prime ideal for each α .*

Proof. First we claim that $Z(R, I) = \bigcup_{M \in M_t(R, I)} Z(R_M, IR_M) \cap R$. Indeed, let $x \in Z(R, I)$. Then there is $a \in R \setminus I$ such that $ax \in I$. Since I is a t -ideal, there is a t -maximal ideal $I \subseteq M$ of R such that $a \in R_M \setminus IR_M$ and $ax \in IR_M$. Hence $x \in Z(R_M, IR_M) \cap R$. Conversely, let $M \in M_t(R, I)$. Since R_M is a valuation domain, there is a t -prime ideal $Q \subseteq M$ such that $Z(R_M, IR_M) = QR_M$. Now we prove that $Q \subseteq Z(R, I)$. Let $z \in Q$. Then $z \in QR_M$ and hence there is $\frac{c}{t} \in R_M \setminus IR_M$ such that $\frac{zc}{t} \in IR_M$ with $c \in R \setminus I$ and $t \in R \setminus M$. This implies that $szc \in I$ for some $s \in R \setminus M$. If $cs \in I$, then $c = \frac{i}{s} \in IR_M$. Thus $\frac{c}{t} \in IR_M$, a contradiction. Then $cs \notin I$ and then $z \in Z(R, I)$. Therefore $Z(R_M, IR_M) \cap R = QR_M \cap R = Q \subseteq Z(R, I)$. Finally, Q 's are t -prime ideals of R ([22, Corollary 2.47]). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.13. (i) Let $u \in (\bigcap R_{Q_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$ and $a \in I$. It is enough to prove that $ua \in I$. Since $u \in \bigcap R_{M_\beta}$, it suffices to show that $ua \in R_{N_\gamma}$ for each γ , where $\{N_\gamma\}$ be the set of t -maximal ideals of R containing I . By [13, Corollary 4.6], $\bigcap R_{Q_\alpha} = R_{R \setminus \cup Q_\alpha}$. Write $u = \frac{r}{s}$, where $r \in R$ and $s \in R \setminus \cup Q_\alpha$.

Fix γ and choose α_1 such that $I \subseteq Q_{\alpha_1} \subseteq N_\gamma$. We claim that $\frac{a}{s} \in R_{N_\gamma}$. For if not, then $\frac{s}{a} = t \in R_{N_\gamma}$ and thus $s = at \in Q_{\alpha_1} R_{N_\gamma} \cap R = Q_{\alpha_1}$, a contradiction. If $ua \notin IR_{N_\gamma}$, then $ua = r(\frac{a}{s}) = \frac{c}{b}$, where $c \in R \setminus I$ and $b \in R \setminus N_\gamma$. Hence $sc = rab \in I$. Thus $s \in \cup Q_\alpha$, a contradiction. Therefore $ua \in IR_{N_\gamma}$, as desired.

(ii) Set $T := (I : I)$. Clearly $T \subseteq \bigcap R_{M_\beta}$. Now we will prove that $T \subseteq \bigcap R_{Q_\alpha}$. By Lemma 2.7(ii), it suffices to show that $(Q_\alpha T)_{t_1} \neq T$ for each α . Since R is a PVMD and I is a t -ideal, T is t -linked over R . Hence $T = R_S$ for some multiplicative closed set S of R since R is a tQR -domain. By the way of contradiction, assume that $(QT)_{t_1} = T$ where $Q = Q_\alpha$ for some α . Then there exists a finitely generated ideal B such that $B_{v_1} = T$ and $B \subseteq QT$. Say

$$B = \sum_{i=1}^{i=r} a_n T \text{ with } a_i \in QT \text{ and write } a_i = \sum_{s=1}^{s=m_i} q_{is} t_{is} \text{ with } q_{is} \in Q \text{ and } t_{is} \in T \text{ for}$$

each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $s = 1, \dots, m_i$. Now let A be the finitely generated ideal of R generated by all q'_{is} . Then $A \subseteq Q$ and $B \subseteq AT$. Hence $T = B_{v_1} \subseteq (AT)_{v_1} \subseteq (A_v T)_{v_1} \subseteq T$ and therefore $(AT)_{v_1} = (A_v T)_{v_1} = T$. Since R is a tQR -domain and T is t -linked over R , by [5, Proposition 2.17], $A_v T = T$. But since $A_v = A_t \subseteq Q$

(here Q is a t -prime ideal by Lemma 2.14), $QT = T$. Hence $1 = \sum_{i=1}^{i=n} q_i a_i$ where

$$q_i \in Q \text{ and } a_i \in T. \text{ Set } J = \sum_{i=1}^{i=n} q_i R. \text{ Clearly } JT = T \text{ and by induction } J^s T = T$$

for all positive integer s . Since R is a tQR -domain, there is a positive integer N and $d \in R$ such that $J^N \subseteq dR \subseteq J_v = J_t \subseteq Q$. Since $J^N T = T$, then $1 = \sum_{i=1}^{i=s} \lambda_i y_i$

where $\lambda_i \in J^N$ and $y_i \in T$, and since $J^N \subseteq dR$, there exists $\mu_i \in R$ such that $\lambda_i = d\mu_i$ for each i . Now, since $d \in Q \subseteq Z(R, I)$, there exists $r \in R \setminus I$ such

$$\text{that } rd \in I. \text{ Hence } r = \sum_{i=1}^{i=s} r \lambda_i y_i = \sum_{i=1}^{i=s} r d y_i \mu_i \in IT = I, \text{ a contradiction. Hence}$$

$(QT)_{t_1} \subsetneq T$ and by Lemma 2.7, $T \subseteq R_Q$, completing the proof. $\square$

3. IDEAL TRANSFORM OVERRINGS OF A PVMD

We start this section with the following theorem which is a generalization of [11, Theorem 3.2.5]. As the proof is similar to that one of [11, Theorem 3.2.5] simply by replacing maximal ideals by t -maximal ideals, we remove it here.

Theorem 3.1. *Let R be a PVMD, I a t -ideal of R , $\{P_\alpha\}$ the set of minimal prime ideals of I , and $\{M_\beta\}$ the set of t -maximal ideals of R that do not contain I . Then:*

- (i) $T(I) \subseteq (\bigcap R_{Q_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$, where Q_β is the unique prime ideal determined by $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^n R_{P_\alpha}$;
- (ii) The equality holds, if I has a finitely many minimal primes.

Our next theorem generalizes [11, Theorem 3.3.7] to *PVMDs*.

Theorem 3.2. *Let P be a non- t -invertible t -prime ideal of a *PVMD* R . Then there is no proper overring of R between P^{-1} and $\Omega(P)$.*

The proof of this theorem involves the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.3. *Let R be a *PVMD*, I a t -ideal of R and let T be a t -linked overring of R contained in $\Omega(I)$. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the sets $S_1 = \{P \in \text{Spec}_t(R) : P \not\subseteq I\}$ and $S_2 = \{Q \in \text{Spec}_t(T) : Q \not\subseteq IT\}$.*

Proof. Define $\Psi : S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ by $\Psi(P) = PR_P \cap T = Q$ for each $P \in S_1$. Then Ψ is well-defined. Indeed, let $P \in S_1$. Since $T \subseteq \Omega(I)$, $T \subseteq R_P$. So $T_{R \setminus P} = R_P$ and then R_P is a t -linked overring of T . Hence $PR_P \cap T$ is a t -prime of T . Also, if $x \in I \setminus P$, then $x \in IT \setminus Q$ and the injectivity of Ψ is clear.

Now, let $Q \in S_2$ and set $P := R \cap Q$. Then $P \not\subseteq I$, and since $R_P = T_Q$, $PR_P = QT_Q$. Hence $\Psi(P) = PR_P \cap T = QT_Q \cap T = Q$. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Under the same notation as Lemma 3.3, if $(IT)_{t_1} = T$, then $T = \Omega(I)$.*

Proof. Assume that $(IT)_{t_1} = T$. Then IT is not contained in any t -prime ideal of T . Since R is a *PVMD* and T is a t -linked overring of R , T is a *PVMD*. By Lemma 3.3, $T = \bigcap_{Q \in \text{Spec}_t(T)} T_Q = \bigcap_{P \in \text{Spec}_t(R), P \not\subseteq I} R_P \supseteq \Omega(I)$. Hence $T = \Omega(I)$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let T be an overring of R such that $P^{-1} \subsetneq T \subseteq \Omega(P)$ and let $\{M_\beta\}$ be the set of all t -maximal ideals of R that do not contain P . By [11, Theorem 3.2.2], $T \subseteq \Omega(P) \subseteq \bigcap R_{M_\beta}$. If $(PT)_{t_1} \neq T$, then $T \subseteq R_P$ (Lemma 2.7(ii)). So $P^{-1} \subsetneq T \subseteq R_P \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta}) = P^{-1}$ ([17, Proposition 1.2]), which is a contradiction. Hence $(PT)_{t_1} = T$, and so $T = \Omega(P)$ by Lemma 3.4. $\square$

Corollary 3.5. (cf. [11, Corollary 3.3.8]) *Let P be a non t -invertible t -prime ideal of a *PVMD* R . Then:*

- (i) $P^{-1} = T(P)$ or $T(P) = \Omega(P)$;
- (ii) If $P \neq (P^2)_t$, then $T(P) = \Omega(P)$;
- (iii) If $P = (P^2)_t$, then $P^{-1} = T(P)$;
- (iv) If P is unbranched, then $P^{-1} = T(P) = \Omega(P)$.

Proof. (i) Follows from Theorem 3.2.

(ii) If $P \neq (P^2)_t$, then there is a prime ideal Q of R such that $\bigcap (P^n)_t R_P = QR_P$. Note that $P \not\subseteq Q$ (otherwise, if $P = Q$, then $PR_P = QR_P$. But $QR_P \subseteq (P^2)_t R_P = P^2 R_P \subsetneq PR_P$, a contradiction). Hence $T(P) \supseteq R_Q \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta}) \supseteq$

$\Omega(P)$, where $\{M_\beta\}$ is the set of all t -maximal ideals of R that do not contain I . Since $T(P) \subseteq \Omega(P)$, $T(P) = \Omega(P)$.

(iii) If $P = (P^2)_t$, then $P = (P^n)_t$ for each $n \geq 1$. Hence $(R : P^n) = (R : (P^n)_t) = (R : P)$. So $T(P) = P^{-1}$ by the definition of $T(P)$.

(iv) Since P is unbranched and $(P^2)_t$ is a P -primary ([17, Proposition 1.3]), $P = (P^2)_t$. Hence $T(P) = P^{-1}$ by (iii). It is clear that $\Omega(P) \supseteq T(P)$. By [8, Proposition 1.2], $P = \bigcup P_\gamma$ where $\{P_\gamma\}$ is the set of primes ideal of R properly contained in P , and we may assume that they are maximal with this property. Then by [13, Corollary 4.6], $R_P = \bigcap R_{P_\gamma}$. Hence by [11, Theorem 3.2.2], $\Omega(P) \subseteq R_P$. Since $\Omega(P) \subseteq \bigcap R_{M_\beta}$, $\Omega(P) \cap R_P \subseteq \bigcap R_{M_\beta} \cap R_P$. It follows that $\Omega(P) \subseteq P^{-1} = T(P)$. Therefore $T(P) = \Omega(P)$. $\square$

Our last theorem generalizes [11, Theorem 3.3.10].

Theorem 3.6. *Let R be a PVMD and P a t -prime ideal of R . Then:*

- (1) $T(P) \subsetneq \Omega(P)$ if and only if $T(P) = R_P \cap \Omega(P)$ and $\Omega(P) \not\subseteq R_P$.
- (2) *The following conditions are equivalent:*
 - (i) $(P\Omega(P))_{t_1} = \Omega(P)$;
 - (ii) $\Omega(P) \not\subseteq R_P$;
 - (iii) $P = \sqrt{I}$ for some t -invertible ideal.

The proof of this theorem involves the following lemmas. First we notice that in [13], Gilmer mentioned that $IT(I) = T(I)$ for any invertible ideal I of an arbitrary domain R . Our first lemma provides a t -analogue result in the class of PVMDs. Note that one can replace the condition “PVMD” on R by assuming that $T(I)$ is a t -flat overring of R .

Lemma 3.7. *Let I be an ideal of a domain R .*

- (i) *If I is t -invertible and R is a PVMD, then $(IT(I))_{t_1} = T(I)$ where t_1 is the t -operation w.r. to $T(I)$.*
- (ii) *If I and J are two ideals of a domain R such that $\sqrt{I} = \sqrt{J}$, then $\Omega(I) = \Omega(J)$.*

Proof. (i) Since I is t -invertible, then there is a finitely generated ideal A of R such that $A \subseteq I_t$ and $A_t = I_t$. Then $T(I) = T(I_t) = T(A_t) = T(A) = \Omega(I)$ and hence $T(I)$ is a t -linked overring of R . Since I is t -invertible, then $(II^{-1})_t = R$ and hence $(I(R : I^n))_t = (R : I^{n-1})$ for each $n \geq 2$. Since $I(R : I^n) \subseteq (I(R : I^n))T(I)$ for each n , then $(I(R : I^n))_t \subseteq (IT(I))_{t_1}$ for each n (Lemma 2.6). Hence $\bigcup (I(R : I^n))_t \subseteq ((I(R : I^n))T(I))_{t_1} = (IT(I))_{t_1}$. So $T(I) = \bigcup (I(R : I^n))_t \subseteq (IT(I))_{t_1} \subseteq T(I)$ and therefore $(IT(I))_{t_1} = T(I)$, as desired.

- (ii) Straightforward via [11, Theorem 3.2.2]. $\square$

Lemma 3.8. (cf. [13, Proposition 25.4]) *Let R be a PVMD and $A_1, \dots, A_n, B, C \in F_t(R)$. Then:*

- (1) *If for each i , A_i is t -finite, then $\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i$ is t -finite.*
- (2) *If B is t -finite, then $(C : B) = (CB^{-1})_t$.*
- (3) *If B and C are t -finite, then $(C :_R B)$ is t -finite.*

Proof. (1) It suffices to prove it for $n = 2$. We have $((A_1 \cap A_2)(A_1 + A_2))_t = (A_1 A_2)_t$ ([14, Theorem 5]). Since A_1 and A_2 are t -invertible, $A_1 A_2$ is t -invertible and therefore $A_1 \cap A_2$ is t -invertible and so t -finite.

(2) If $x \in (R : B)C$, then $x = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i c_i$ where $b_i B \subseteq R$ and $c_i \in C$. Hence $xB = \sum c_i b_i B \subseteq RC \subseteq C$. So $(R : B)C \subseteq (C : B)$. Therefore $((R : B)C)_t \subseteq (C : B)_t = (C : B)$. Conversely, we have $B(C : B) \subseteq C$. Then $(C : B) = (C : B)_t = ((C : B)BB^{-1})_t \subseteq (CB^{-1})_t$.

(3) By definition, $(C :_R B) = (C :_R B)_t = ((C : B) \cap R)_t = ((CB^{-1})_t \cap R)_t$. Since C and B are t -finite, $(CB^{-1})_t$ is t -finite. So by (1), $(C :_R B)$ is t -finite. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.6 (1) Assume that $T(P) \subsetneq \Omega(P)$. Then P is a non- t -invertible t -prime ideal of R (otherwise, if P is t -invertible, then P is t -finite, i.e. there is a finitely generated ideal A of R such that $P = A_t$. Hence $\Omega(P) = \Omega(A_t) = \Omega(A) = T(A) = T(A_t) = T(P)$, a contradiction). Since $T(P)$ is a subintersection of a PVMD R , it is t -linked over R ([22, Theorem 2.22]), and so t -flat over R ([24, Theorem 2.10]). By Theorem 3.2, $P^{-1} = T(P)$. Hence $T(P) = R_P \cap \Omega(P)$ by [17, Proposition 1.1] and [11, Theorem 3.2.2]. Therefore $\Omega(P) \not\subseteq R_P$. The converse is trivial.

(2) (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Since $P = \sqrt{I}$, $\Omega(P) = \Omega(I)$ by Lemma 3.7(ii). Since I is t -invertible, by Lemma 3.7 $(IT(I))_{t_1} = T(I)$. Also since I is t -invertible, there is a finitely generated ideal A of R such that $A \subseteq I$ and $I_t = A_t$. Hence $T(I) = T(I_t) = T(A_t) = T(A) = \Omega(A) = \Omega(A_t) = \Omega(I_t) = \Omega(I)$ by [9, Proposition 3.4]. So $\Omega(P) = \Omega(I) = (I\Omega(I))_{t_1} \subseteq (P\Omega(I))_{t_1} = (P\Omega(P))_{t_1} \subseteq \Omega(P)$.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) By [11, Theorem 3.2.2] and [4, Proposition 4], $\Omega(P)$ is a t -linked overring of R . Since $\Omega(P) \not\subseteq R_P$, $(P\Omega(P))_{t_1} = \Omega(P)$ by Lemma 2.7(ii).

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) Let $\{Q_\alpha\}$ be the set of all t -prime ideals of R that do not contain P . Choose $x \in \Omega(P) \setminus R_P$. Write $x = \frac{a}{b}$ where $a, b \in R$. If $I = (bR :_R aR)$, then $I \not\subseteq Q_\alpha$ for each α and $I \subseteq P$. By Lemma 3.8, I is t -finite and $\sqrt{I} = P$. For this if $z \notin \sqrt{I}$, then $z^n \notin A_v$ for each finitely generated ideal A of R such that $A \subseteq I$. Hence $z^n ab^{-1} \notin R$ for each n . Since $ab^{-1} \in \Omega(P)$, $z \notin P$.

Corollary 3.9. (cf. [11, Corollary 3.3.11]) *Let R be a PVMD and P a non- t -maximal t -prime ideal of R . Then $T(P) \subsetneq \Omega(P)$ if and only if $P = (P^2)_t$ and $P = \sqrt{I}$ for some t -invertible ideal I of R*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$) Since $T(P) \subsetneq \Omega(P)$, $P = (P^2)_t$ (Corollary 3.5(ii)) and $\Omega(P) \not\subseteq R_P$ (Theorem 3.6). Hence there is a t -invertible ideal of R satisfies $P = \sqrt{I}$ (Theorem 3.6).

$\Leftarrow$) $P = (P^2)_t$ implies that $P^{-1} = T(P)$ by Corollary 3.5(iii). Since $P = \sqrt{I}$ for some t -invertible ideal I of R , $\Omega(P) \not\subseteq R_P$ by Theorem 3.6. By [18, Theorem 4.5] $P^{-1} = R_P \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\beta})$, where $\{M_\beta\}$ is the set of all t -maximal ideals of R that do not contain P . By [11, Theorem 3.2.2], $T(P) = P^{-1} = R_P \cap \Omega(P)$. By Theorem 3.6, $T(P) \subsetneq \Omega(P)$ $\square$

Corollary 3.10. (cf. [11, Corollary 3.3.12]) *Let R be a PVMD and P a non- t -invertible t -prime ideal of R . Then:*

$(PT(P))_{t_1} \neq T(P)$ and $(P\Omega(P))_{t_2} = \Omega(P)$ if and only if $P^{-1} = T(P) \subsetneq \Omega(P)$ where t_1 (resp. t_2) is the t -operation w.r. to $T(I)$ (resp. $\Omega(I)$).

Proof. If $(PT(P))_{t_1} \neq T(P)$ and $(P\Omega(P))_{t_2} = \Omega(P)$, then clearly $T(P) \subsetneq \Omega(P)$. Hence $P^{-1} = T(P)$ by Theorem 3.2. Conversely, if $P^{-1} = T(P) \subsetneq \Omega(P)$, then $(PT(P))_{t_1} \neq T(P)$ by Lemma 3.4. Moreover $P = \sqrt{I}$ for some t -invertible ideal I of R by Corollary 3.9. Therefore $(P\Omega(P))_{t_2} = \Omega(P)$ by Theorem 3.6. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] D. F. Anderson, When the dual of an ideal is a ring, Houston J. Math. **9**(3) (1983), 325–331. 8
- [2] V. Barucci, S. Gabelli, and M. Roitman, The class group of a strongly Mori domain, Comm. Algebra **22** (1) (1994), 173–211. 6
- [3] J. Brewer, The ideal transform and overrings of an integral domain, Math. Z. **107** (1968), 301–306. 1
- [4] J. Brewer and W. J. Heinzer, Associated primes of principal ideals, Duke Math. J. **41** (1974), 1–7. 14
- [5] D. E. Dobbs, E. Houston, T. Lucas and M. Zafrullah, t -Linked overrings and Prüfer v -multiplication domains, Comm. Algebra **17** (11) (1989), 2835–2852. 6, 11
- [6] D. E. Dobbs, E. Houston, T. Lucas and M. Zafrullah, t -Linked overrings and intersections of localizations, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **109** (3) (1990), 637–646. 10
- [7] S. El Baghdadi, On a class of Prüfer v -multiplication domains, Comm. Algebra **30** (2002), 3723–3742. 7, 8
- [8] S. El Baghdadi and S. Gabelli, Ring-theoretic properties of PVMD, Comm. Algebra **35** (2007), 1607–1625. 13
- [9] M. Fontana, Kaplansky ideal transform: a survey, Lect. Notes Pure Appl. Math., Dekker, 205 (2002), 271–306. 14
- [10] M. Fontana, J. Huckaba, and I. Papick, Domains satisfying the trace property, J. Algebra **107** (1987), 169–182. 9

- [11] *M. Fontana, J. A. Huckaba and I. J. Papick*, Prüfer Domains, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 203. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1997. 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15
- [12] *M. Fontana, J. A. Huckaba, I. J. Papick and M. Roitman*, Prüfer domains and endomorphism rings of their ideals, *J. Algebra* **157** (1993), 489–516. 2, 3, 10
- [13] *R. Gilmer*, Multiplicative Ideal Theory, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1972. 1, 4, 6, 10, 13, 14
- [14] *M. Griffin*, Some results on v -multiplication rings, *Canad. J. Math.* **19** (1967), 710–722. 14
- [15] *J. Hays*, The S -transform and the ideal transform, *J. Algebra* **57** (1979), 224–229. 1
- [16] *W. Heinzer and I. J. Papick*, the radical trace property, *J. Algebra* **112** (1988), 110–121. 2, 6, 7
- [17] *E. Houston*, On divisorial prime ideals in Prüfer v -multiplication domains, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **42** (1986), 55–62. 2, 12, 13, 14
- [18] *E. Houston, S. Kabbaj, T. Lucas and A. Mimouni*, When is the dual of an ideal a ring? *J. Algebra* **225** (2000), 429–450. 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 15
- [19] *J. A. Huckaba and I. J. Papick*, When the dual of an ideal is a ring, *Manuscripta Math.* **37** (1) (1982), 67–85. 2, 4, 5
- [20] *S. Kabbaj and A. Mimouni*, t -Class Semigroups of Integral Domains, *J. reine angew. Math.* **612** (2007), 213–229. 5, 7, 8
- [21] *S. Kabbaj and A. Mimouni*, t -Class Semigroups of GCD domains, in preparation. 8
- [22] *B. G. Kang*, $\ast$ -Operations in integral domains, Ph.D. thesis, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1987. 5, 8, 9, 10, 14
- [23] *I. kaplansky*, Topics in commutative ring theory, Notes from Dep. Math., Uni. of Chicago (1974) 1
- [24] *D. J. Kwak and Y. S. Park*, On t -flat overrings, *Chinese J. Math.* **23** (1) (1995), 17–24. 6, 7, 14
- [25] *M. Zafrullah*, On finite conductor domains, *manuscripta. math.* **24** (1978), 191–204. 4

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KING FAHD UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM & MINERALS, DHAHRAN 31261, SAUDI ARABIA

E-mail address: g200502650@kfupm.edu.sa

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KING FAHD UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM & MINERALS, P. O. BOX 278, DHAHRAN 31261, SAUDI ARABIA

E-mail address: amimouni@kfupm.edu.sa